

INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION SUPPLEMENTAL EDUCATIONAL SERVICES

2007-2008 COMPLIANCE AND ON-SITE MONITORING REPORT FOR:

Sylvan Learning Center (New Albany, IN)

DOCUMENT ANALYSIS		OBSERVATION		COMPLIANCE	
Tutor Qualifications	Satisfactory	Lesson matches original description	Approaching/Meeting Standard (2.5)	Criminal Background Checks	
Recruiting Materials		Instruction is clear	Meeting Standard (3)	Health/safety laws & regulations	
Academic Program		Time on task is appropriate	Meeting Standard (3)	Financial viability	
Progress Reporting	Satisfactory*	Instructor is appropriately knowledgeable	Meeting Standard (3)		
Assessment and Individual Program Design	Satisfactory	Student/instructor ratio: 3:1	Meeting Standard (3)		

(As per the on-site monitoring rubric instructions, while monitoring/ observation of SES providers is completed annually, document and compliance analysis is completed every two years. Since Sylvan New Albany's document and compliance analysis was completed during the 2006-2007 school year, an observation and only a limited document analysis was completed for the 2007-2008 school year).

ACTION NEEDED:

*Although Sylvan's progress reports were satisfactory, as per the IDOE progress report checklist, Sylvan New Albany must ensure that progress reports include the additional information identified in the Progress Reporting section of the Document Analysis portion of this report.

On-site Monitoring Visit Rubric DOCUMENT ANALYSIS Components

NAME OF PROVIDER: Sylvan (New Albany)
REVIEWER: MC

DATE DOCUMENTATION RECEIVED: 4/28/08

Providers are required to submit documentation for each component during the site visit. If documentation is not available on-site, the director or head of the provider's organization, the site director, or another authorized representative will be required to submit documentation to the IDOE within seven (7) calendar days of site visit completion. **Failure to submit evidence could result in removal from the approved provider list.** Providers will be given an Unsatisfactory or Satisfactory for each component. Providers receiving an Unsatisfactory for any component may be required to address deficiencies within 7 calendar days of receiving their final report.

COMPONENT	DOCUMENTATION NEEDED	DOCUMENTATION SUBMITTED (IDOE use only)	UNSATISFACTORY	SATISFACTORY	COMMENTS
Tutor qualifications	ALL of the following: -Documentation of professional development opportunities in which tutors have participated (i.e. sign-sheets, agendas, presentations, certificates of completion, etc.)	Tutor training agenda Tutor training description Sign-in sheets		X	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tutors participate in monthly meetings conducted by the Director of Education. In the meetings, tutors discuss program information, updates, etc. The meetings are mandatory; tutors are allowed only 2 absences per year. January and February teacher meetings provided information about proper procedures for reading and math. Tutor sign-in sheets were submitted for both January and February meetings.
Progress Reporting	ALL of the following: -Progress reports (see IDOE e-mail for details regarding the request for progress reports) -Timeline for sending progress reports -Documentation of reports sent	Timeline for progress reporting Documentation of progress reports sent Progress reports SES contract SES agreements		X	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Progress reports are sent monthly to parents and monthly to districts. Progress reports are also logged using a computer-based system. Progress report includes information about long-term academic goals (by completion of the program), current grade, skills to cover, progress made toward goals, current skills being worked on, and comments about student strengths and weaknesses. Progress reports are signed by student and parents. Progress reports are sent to parents and the district monthly. Information from one district surveyed indicates that progress reports have been sent in a

					<p>timely manner.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Skills identified on progress reports to be covered in tutoring sessions are same as standards/skills identified in the SES agreement. • Final progress report includes pre-assessment scores, progress scores, and post-assessment scores. • As per IDOE and USDE guidance (detailed in the progress report checklist sent to providers in December 2007), progress reports also need to include the following information: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A written statement regarding how parents can provide feedback on how the progress report can be improved.
Assessment and Individual Program Design	<p>ALL of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Explanation of the process provider uses to develop Individual learning plans for each student - Pre-assessment scores and Individual learning plan for at least one student in each subject provider tutors (any identifying information for the student(s) must be blanked out) -Explanation and evidence regarding how provider's pre and post-test assessment correlates to Indiana academic standards. 	<p>Individual learning plans & pre-assessment scores</p> <p>Correlation between assessment and standards</p> <p>Description of process for developing individual learning plans</p>		X	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The CAT is used to identify student skill gaps, strengths, and weaknesses. The CAT is used to develop the individual learning plan. • Specific standards assessed by the CAT were provided; the CAT covers standards in grades K-8, including number sense, computation, measurement, and problem solving in math, and word recognition, fluency, and vocabulary, reading comprehension, literary response and analysis, and listening and speaking in English/Language Arts. • Individual learning plan identifies current, previous, and target grade equivalents as well as scale score on the CAT. • Sylvan Plan for Success (similar to progress report) identifies long-term academic goals for the student in each area of reading or math, as determined by the CAT pre-test.

On-site Monitoring Rubric OBSERVATION Components

NAME OF PROVIDER: Sylvan Learning Center (New Albany)

SITE: Sylvan Learning Center, 4008 Northside Drive, Suite 1
New Albany, IN 47150

TUTOR'S INITIALS (ALL TUTORS OBSERVED): L.R.

NUMBER OF LESSONS OBSERVED: 1

DATE: 4/15/08

REVIEWER: MC/ST

TIME OF OBSERVATION: 4:45PM

During the site visit, IDOE personnel will visit several tutoring sessions to observe lessons being provided. IDOE reviewers will be looking to see that actual tutoring matches lesson plan descriptions that are provided in requested documents, as well as those that were provided in the original provider application; that tutors and students are spending an appropriate amount of time on task; that instruction is clear and understandable; and that instructors seem knowledgeable about lesson content.

Each provider will receive a score of 1-4 points for each component. Providers receiving "1 or 2 points" on any component may be required to address deficiencies within 7 calendar days of receiving their final report. Failure to address deficiencies may result in removal from the state approved list.

COMPONENT	1 Below Standard	2 Approaching Standard	3 Meeting Standard	4 Exceeding Standard	REVIEWER COMMENTS
Lesson matches original description in provider application			X		<p>Tutor worked with a group of three students; each student was working on an individually-designed program. Each student had a binder with work in it, including worksheets and lessons. Each student also had a Skills (reading or math) workbook. . Two of the students in the group worked primarily independently. The tutor interacted with them periodically, but tutor interaction was mostly limited to checking their work or providing instructions. The tutor provided some instruction (including asking comprehension questions and using prompts to help the student come to the correct answer) with one of the students in the group.</p> <p>Each student worked from a binder that was individually designed based on the student's pre-assessment, which matches the description in the originally approved application. The tutor attempted to rotate between students as they worked on lessons. Students spent time on independent practice of skills taught, which is a component of the lesson description provided in the originally approved application. While the originally approved application indicates that an additional 20-25 minutes will be spent on direct instruction, in the observed lesson, while one student received direct instruction that included questioning and some strategy instruction, the other two students spent most of the time observed working on independent practice. Tutor interaction was generally limited to correcting work and ensuring that students understood the instructions to complete their assignments. It seemed that the other two students did not receive their share of the direct instruction as described in the originally approved application.</p>

Instruction is clear			X		Students primarily worked independently on individually assigned lessons from their binders. Each student seemed to have a clear understanding of what he or she was supposed to work on, and students had little to no difficulty transitioning from one activity to the next. Instruction provided to one of the students in the group seemed clear and the tutor tried to help the student build on prior knowledge and help her understand what skills she was expected to learn. The tutor also employed some strategies to help the student with her reading comprehension. With the other two students in the group, the instruction was primarily in the form of checking their work, reading instructions for them, or ensuring that they knew which lessons they were supposed to be working on.
Time on task is appropriate			X		Students stayed on task while working on lessons. The tutor tried to work with each student individually to ensure that each student was working on the assigned task or lesson. In some cases, it was difficult for the tutor to spend equal time with each student. However, students were able to focus on their assignments. When a student got off task or wasn't paying attention, the tutor didn't always notice right away, but then after some time usually turned to the student and asked about progress or asked if the student had any questions. Because of the way that lessons were organized, it was easy for students to transition from one task to another with no to very minimal disruption. Despite there being multiple groups of students in the room, the room was quiet and conducive to learning.
Instructor is appropriately knowledgeable			X		The instructor appeared to be aware of the lessons that each student was supposed to be working on and seemed aware of the lesson plans for each student in the group for that day. The tutor also appeared to recognize that one student in the group needed more assistance working on her lessons than the other two students in the group. At times, it appeared that one of the students in the group was getting a little bored with his lesson and was struggling to stay focused (although none of the students was ever disruptive). The tutor didn't always seem to recognize this; when the tutor did recognize that the student was losing interest, the tutor tried to turn to him and encourage him to keep working, as him if he had any questions, or ask him if he understood the material.
Student/instructor ratio: 3:1 Ratio matches that reported in original provider application			X		The ratio matches the ratio described in the originally approved application.